

IN THE DRAWINGS

Attached is a set of formal drawings. Please substitute the new formal drawings for the previously filed informal drawings.

R E M A R K S

After amendment, independent claims 1, 2 and 3 are present in the case.

CLAIMS 1, 2 AND 3 ALLOWABLE IF AMENDED

The Examiner has cited that claims 1, 2 and 3 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Applicant has amended the claims as requested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1, 2 and 3.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings were objected to because the application was filed with informal drawings.

Formal drawings are herein provided.

Since formal drawings are provided, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the drawings and that the drawings be passed to issuance.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 1, 2 AND 3 DUE TO INFORMALITIES

Claims 1, 2 and 3 were objected to because of informalities. The claims contained the steps of removing the tape by pulling the tab.

The examiner's objection to claims 1, 2 and 3 is noted with appreciation. Applicant agrees with the examiner that the "removing" and

“pulling” language in the apparatus claims is best removed. Claims 1-3 have been amended, as requested by the examiner, to correct the claims to better define the final product, the demountable and reusable wall assembly.

However, applicant respectfully reserves the right to file continuing applications on the method or process aspects of any disclosed invention or any invention to be disclosed in combination with the subject matter in the present application.

It is respectfully requested that the examiners objection has been rectified and that claims 1, 2 and 3, with respect to the examiners objection, are in condition for allowance. Since the informalities have been corrected as requested by the examiner, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2 and 3 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Particularly, the phrases “can be” and “may be” was referenced as rendering the claims as indefinite.

The rejection of claims 1, 2 and 3 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, is also noted with appreciation. The phrases “can be” and “may be” are indefinite since it should be clear that the limitations following the referenced phrases are part of the claimed invention. The phrases “can be” and “may be” were used in the application as filed because experimentation was ongoing and continues with respect to various embodiments. It has been determined that the specific embodiments as clearly defined in

Response To Office Action
Serial No.: 09/652,648
Art Unit: 3635

amended claims 1, 2 and 3 are the best mode of practicing the claimed invention.

It is respectfully requested that the examiners rejection has been corrected and that claims 1, 2 and 3, with respect to the examiners rejection, are in condition for allowance. For the reasons given above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. §112 and allowance of claims 1, 2 and 3.


**COMMENTS ON REMAINING REFERENCES
CITED BY THE EXAMINER**

Applicant has reviewed the additional references made of record and does not believe any one of these references taken alone or in combination would inhibit the patentability of the invention of the present application.

SUMMARY

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims in the present application are allowable. It is believed that this case is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Alton W. Payne
Reg. No. 30,580

Date: 4/4/02

5001 Bissonnet, Suite 200
Bellaire, Texas 77401
(713) 840-8008
Fax: (713) 661-6001